

PART IV - SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 FAA AMS CLAUSE 3.1-1 CLAUSES AND PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (December 2005)

This screening information request (SIR) or contract, as applicable, incorporates by reference the provisions or clauses listed below with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer (CO) will make the full text available, or offerors and contractors may obtain the full text via the internet at <http://conwrite.faa.gov> (on this web page, select "Search and View Clauses").

- 3.2.4-31** **Evaluation of Options** (April 1996)
- 3.3.1-30** **Progress Payments Not Included** (November 1997)
- 3.11-50** **No Evaluation of Transportation Costs** (April 1999)

M.2 INFORMATION AND CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING VENDOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

(a) This acquisition will employ best practices and procedures for competitive negotiated procurements as authorized by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Acquisition Management System (AMS), as amended, January 2011.

(b) All offers will be screened initially to determine if they are in compliance with the Screening Information Request (SIR) procurement response instructions. These instructions include the requirement that offerors only respond to one Service Area specific SIR as a prime contractor. The FAA reserves the right to eliminate all offers submitted by an offeror if these instructions are not followed or if the offeror does not clearly demonstrate understanding of the requirements of the SIR. In the event a proposal is rejected a notice will be sent to the offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposals will not be given further consideration.

(c) Each proposal will be evaluated on the basis of its written submissions and cost/price information described in Section L. Separate technical and cost/price proposals are required as described in Section L.

(d) All offers will be subjected to a detailed evaluation by the Proposals Evaluation Team (PET).

- (1) The offer, other documents, cost, and pricing volume will be subjected to a detailed price analysis based on the acquisition of commercial services by the Cost/Price Evaluation Team (CPET) that will determine whether or not a fair and reasonable price is being offered.
- (2) The management, technical, and past technical performance volume will be subjected to a detailed evaluation by the Technical Evaluation Team (TET) that will rate proposals in accordance with a pre-established evaluation plan.

(e) Technical proposals will be evaluated, rated, and scored in accordance with pre-established evaluation factors. These factors are listed in Provision M.5.1.

(f) Cost/Price proposals will be reviewed for mathematical accuracy, reasonableness, and realism.

(g) The cost/price evaluation team will not have access to technical proposals during the cost/price evaluation. Likewise, the technical evaluation team will not have access to price/cost proposals during the technical evaluation.

(h) The offer that provides the overall best value to the FAA will be selected. The successful offer may not necessarily be the lowest priced offer. Management, technical and past technical performance are significantly more important than cost/price. If total factor scores are close together, price will become more important. The FAA will also consider risk in its determination of best value.

(i) All proposals must be submitted in accordance with Section L and must conform to all the terms and conditions of the SIR. Failure to conform to all requirements expressed may be cause for rejection without further evaluation or discussion.

(j) Additional information may be requested from the vendor whose proposal the FAA considers to represent the overall best value. The information may clarify or supplement, but not basically change the proposal as submitted. The FAA reserves the right to award a contract based on initial offers received, without discussions or negotiations. For this reason, each initial offer should be submitted on the most favorable terms from the standpoint of technical and price/cost.

(k) In accordance with clause 3.2.2.3-19 of this SIR, the FAA reserves the right to limit offerors participating in the competition to only those most likely to receive a contract award. Vendors will be notified if a down-selection decision results in their elimination from further consideration for award.

M.3 EVALUATION OF OFFERS

(a) The offeror must provide adequate and specific information in their proposal. A proposal may be eliminated from further consideration if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be unacceptable without further evaluation. An offer will be deemed grossly and obviously deficient if it fails to comply with the material instructions in Section L to include: required forms, volumes, certifications, etc.

(b) Tiered Evaluation. In order to provide opportunities for small businesses, the acquisition strategy for this procurement is anticipated to use a tiered evaluation of offerors with the following tiers:

- I. 8(a) Companies
- II. SDVOSB
- III. Small Businesses
- IV. Large Businesses

- (1) Tiered evaluation of offers is a process by which FAA promotes small business participation while providing the FAA a means to continue the procurement if small business participation is insufficient.
- (2) The FAA may use tiered evaluation of offers to promote competition in each tier of small business concerns while still allowing other than small business to participate without issuing another SIR.
- (3) The FAA will consider the tiers of small business concerns prior to evaluating offers from other than small business concerns.

All business classifications will be encouraged to submit offers for this SIR. The FAA will proceed with the evaluation of offerors and award within the lowest tier found to contain adequate competition among technically acceptable offers. An offer is considered technically acceptable if:

- 1) The offer is not grossly or obviously deficient; and
- 2) The offer receives at least a marginal evaluation rating in the management, technical, and past performance factors.

Adequate competition exists when at least two offers are compared. If only one proposal is received in a lower tier, this offer from a lower tier may compete with higher tiered submissions in order to achieve adequate competition

Each offeror may be considered as a prime contractor for only one Service Area (SA) award but has the ability to pursue subcontracting opportunities on other service area awards without restriction. The FAA will only recognize one Prime Contractor per offer. In accordance with AMS clause 3.6.1-7 Limitations on Subcontracting at least 50% of the work must be performed by employees of the Prime contractor Award for awards made under the first three tiers.

(c) Alternate proposals will not be evaluated. In the event a proposal is rejected a notice will be sent to the offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposals will not be given further consideration.

M.4 SUMMARY OF OVERALL EVALUATION AND DOWN-SELECT PROCESS

(a) Cost/Price, management, technical, and past technical performance are evaluated as set forth herein. The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) will consider tradeoffs between technical and cost/price factors. Management, technical and past technical performance are significantly more important than price in determining the overall best value to the FAA.

(b) Management, Technical, and Past Technical Performance Evaluation - The management, technical, and past technical performance volume will henceforth be referred to as the technical proposal/volume. Technical proposals will be reviewed by the TET in order to determine whether the minimum requirements of the Statement of Work (SOW) have been met. Technical proposals that have been evaluated to meet the minimum requirements as identified in the SOW will then be further evaluated and scored according to their ability to exceed the requirements identified in the SOW and the evaluation factors listed in Section M.5.1. Technical scores are then ranked in preparation for a Best Value determination. Technical proposals that have been evaluated and determined to not meet the minimum requirements as identified in the SOW will be eliminated from further consideration.

(c) Risk Assessment - The Government will assess the risk associated with conducting business with each vendor. This risk assessment will be completed after the technical evaluation. The risk assessment will be used to help determine best value for the government.

(d) Cost/Price Evaluation - The CPET will evaluate offers in accordance with M.6 below. Unlike technical proposal submissions, cost/price proposals will not be scored. Results of this cost/price analyses are forwarded to the PET for inclusion in the Best Value determination.

(e) Best Value Determination - Using the results from the TET and the CPET, the offer that provides the best overall value to the FAA will be selected for award. A tradeoff between technical and price may be considered, in which case, the lowest total evaluated price offer may not provide the greatest overall value to the Government. If a tradeoff is considered, that determination will be made by the Source Selection Officer.

M.5 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

M.5.1 Evaluation Factors

(a) The evaluation factors listed below are intended to determine the vendor's capabilities to effectively and efficiently provide Security Officer Services to the FAA.

(1) Factor 1 – Management Proposal:

(i) Sub-Factor 1.1 – Management Approach

This sub factor will be evaluated on the degree to which the proposed management approach, subcontracting arrangements, and offeror organization will effectively and efficiently oversee guard services. Similarly, the degree to which the offeror proposes efficient and effective management efforts regarding day-to-day as well as emergency or contingency operations will be evaluated. The offeror's Management Plan as required in Section C.17.1 and L.6.1.1 will also be evaluated under this sub-factor.

(ii) Sub-Factor 1.2 – Transition

This sub factor will be evaluated based on the degree to which the proposed transition methodology, timeline, staffing, and staff qualifications and training will ensure a timely, effective, and efficient transition of guard services. The offeror's Transition Plan as required in Section C.17.2 and L.6.1.2 will also be evaluated under this sub-factor.

(2) Factor 2 – Technical Proposal:

(i) Sub-Factor 2.1 – Staffing

This sub factor will be evaluated based on the degree to which the offeror's proposed staffing processes and procedures effectively and efficiently satisfy the requirements stated in Section C.5, C.6 and L.6.2.1. Proposed measures regarding temporary additionally staffing, maintenance of staff certifications, and records control will also be evaluated here for effectiveness and efficiency.

(ii) Sub-Factor 2.2 – Continuity of Operations

This sub factor will be evaluated based on the degree to which the offeror proposes strategies for effectively and efficiently identifying and tracking emergencies, pandemics and the degree to which the offeror proposes effective and efficient means of ensuring that guard services continue to meet the FAA's needs in such emergencies.

(iii) Sub-Factor 2.3 – Quality Assurance

This sub factor will be evaluated based on the degree to which the offeror proposes strategies for effectively and efficiently ensuring that the quality of service provided under the contract is of the highest level according to Section L.6.2.3. Proposed measures regarding the supervision of security officers and quality control will also be evaluated here for effectiveness and efficiency.

(3) Factor 3 – Past Technical Performance

(i) Sub-Factor 3.1 – Relevant Past Experience and Performance

In accordance with L.6.3.1, this sub factor will be evaluated based upon the completed L.1 attachments and the receipt of questionnaires, attachment L.2, completed by customers, assessing the performance of the offeror on relevant contracts that are similar in scope and magnitude to this SIR. The contracts selected by the offeror must demonstrate that the offeror has an understanding of the work to be performed. The Government will determine the relevance of a contract offered by the vendor to demonstrate past performance by analyzing the following and comparing it to the SIR:

- (a) Scope – Contract relevance will be evaluated based on the type of service provided. A relevant contract example exists where similar security officer services have been offered in the past. For example a contract relevance determination focuses on whether or not SOs are armed; type of SO qualifications and training requirements; type of permit, licensure and certification requirements in performance of the effort; typical duties and responsibilities required of security force; type of protection required (e.g. interior and exterior building protection vs. exterior-only protection and gate access control); and the number and geographic dispersion of service sites;
- (b) Magnitude – The magnitude of a contract offered under relevant past experience will be evaluated through the following: the number of productive hours per year, number of SO personnel to support the effort, total contract value and potential subcontractors, if proposed, under a single contract.

(ii) Sub-Factor 3.2 – Related Information

This sub factor will be evaluated based on the offeror's related information that complements the services required under this SIR in accordance with L.6.3.2. If there is no related information, the offeror must affirmatively state that it possesses no related information. No related information will result in a satisfactory rating.

(b) The weight assignments for each of the technical evaluation factors are as follows:

Factor/Sub factor	Percentage
1. Management Proposal*	20%

Sub-Factor 1.1 Management Approach	40%	
Sub-Factor 1.2 Transition	60%	
2. Technical Proposal*		45%
Sub-Factor 2.1 Staffing	65%	
Sub-Factor 2.2 Continuity of Operations	15%	
Sub-Factor 2.3 Quality Assurance	20%	
3. Past Technical Experience and Performance*		35%
Sub-Factor 3.1 Relevant Past Experience and Performance	80%	
Sub-Factor 3.2 Related Information	20%	
TOTAL		100%

*NOTE: The three factors above comprise the entirety of the technical evaluation criteria.

M.5.2 Evaluation Ratings

(a) Factors will be rated by the evaluation team on the rating scale shown below. Team ratings for each factor will be weighted to establish a score for the technical proposal.

- 4 = Excellent
- 3 = Good
- 2 = Satisfactory
- 1 = Marginal
- 0 = Unsatisfactory

(b) The numerical ratings relate to the following definitions:

Excellent (4.0)

Almost all aspects of the evaluation factor are addressed in a highly competent, substantiated, and logical fashion. Information clearly demonstrates that requirements can be met in a manner that far exceeds an acceptable level. Offers in this category demonstrate that performance can be provided at a level that exceeds expectations or as a superior value. Any weaknesses, if present, are insignificant or are far outweighed by strengths.

Good (3.0)

A majority of aspects of the evaluation factor are addressed in a highly substantiated and logical fashion. Information clearly demonstrates that requirements can be met in a manner that exceeds an acceptable level. Proposals, demonstrate that performance can be provided at a level above average requirements. Any weaknesses are insignificant or are outweighed by strengths.

Satisfactory (2.0)

Most aspects of the evaluation factors are addressed in a substantiated and logical fashion. Performance capability is determined to be acceptable so that a majority of the requirements will be met. Weaknesses will not seriously degrade performance and can be corrected with reasonable effort.

Marginal (1.0)

Most significant aspects of the evaluation factor are addressed. Information provided demonstrates that only minimum requirements can be fully met. There is some concern that a satisfactory performance level can be achieved or sustained. Weaknesses or deficiencies are evident and may require considerable effort to correct.

Unsatisfactory (0.0)

The proposal fails to address the key aspects of the evaluation factor. Information provided indicates that most minimum requirements will not be met. Weaknesses or deficiencies are significant and will require major correction(s).

M.5.2 Evaluation Definitions

The following definitions are applicable:

- (a) **Deficiency** - A descriptive statement or lack thereof that fails to meet the requirements.
- (b) **Clarification** - Normally used to eliminate minor irregularities or apparent clerical mistakes in the proposal or presentation. Clarification of apparent clerical mistakes includes correction of statements within the offer; it does not include the providing of additional information not previously contained within the proposal.
- (c) **Strength** - An aspect of the technical proposal that has a positive effect for the Government. An example would be an especially thoughtful, innovative or unique solution or approach to an evaluation area. Likewise, a strength may also be a unique solution, approach, or process to a technical or management problem or requirement that saves time, material and could potentially reduce cost.
- (d) **Weakness** - A flaw in the proposal that while it meets the minimum requirements of the SIR, it increases the potential for unsuccessful contract performance or otherwise has a negative impact on the Government.
- (e) **Substantiated** - Competent, documented evidence that supports or otherwise verifies proposal claims, approaches, and contents.

M.6 PRICE ANALYSIS

PRICE ANALYSIS PHASES:

- (a) **PHASE ONE:** The CPET will evaluate prices proposed under CLIN XXXX1A, Transition, for price reasonableness as either acceptable “Pass” or unacceptable “Fail” prior to any further evaluation of the other aspects of the offeror’s price proposal. Price Reasonableness is defined as the price that a prudent businessperson would pay for an item or service under competitive market conditions, given a reasonable knowledge of the marketplace. Based on this evaluation, the offeror’s price proposal will move on to an evaluation of all aspects of the offeror’s proposal if it is determined to “Pass” the initial review. If the offeror’s transition price is determined to “Fail” this initial review, the proposal will not be further evaluated and be rejected. In the event a proposal is rejected during this phase of evaluation, a notice will be sent to the offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposals will not be given further consideration.
- (b) **PHASE TWO:** The CPET will evaluate prices from each vendor for the base contract period and all option contract periods as shown below. This phase of the evaluation will result in a total evaluated price which will be forwarded to the PET for inclusion in the Best Value determination. NOTE: this total evaluated price will not include the prices proposed under CLIN XXXX1A Transition.
 - 1) CLIN XXXX1B, Basic Services. All contract period prices for each location will be summed.
 - 2) CLIN XXXX2, TAS. A value of \$25,000 will be applied to all offers in order to equally evaluate the potential for Temporary Additional Services.
 - 3) CLIN XXXX3, ESS. The evaluated price for 16 hours of Emergency Security Services per site per contract year will be applied to all offers in order to equally evaluate the potential for Emergency Security Services.
 - 4) CLIN XXXX4, CAGP Cabinet. The \$55 per site price for this item will be applied to all offers for evaluation purposes regardless of whether the FAA intends to authorize the selected offeror to purchase this item following contract award.

- (c) The FAA will conduct a price analysis to determine price reasonableness based on competition. If reasonableness of price cannot be determined through adequate price competition or by other method(s) of price analysis, the FAA will evaluate additional information as required to establish price reasonableness.
- (d) Proposals, whether initial or revised submissions, which are unreasonably low or high may be eliminated from further competition on the grounds of the vendor's failure to comprehend contract requirements.
- (e) Proposals that reflect unbalanced prices may be eliminated from further consideration on the basis that such pricing may increase performance risk and could result in payment of unreasonably high prices.
- (f) Cost data provided by offerors will be used to verify compliance with the Service Contract act and all applicable labor laws relevant to this contract.

M.7 RISK ASSESSMENT

- (a) A risk assessment will be accomplished at the conclusion of the overall evaluation process (i.e., evaluation of Factors 1 through 3 as well as related pricing). The risk assessment is intended to aid the source selection process by adding more information to the best value determination.
- (b) The risk assessment will be conducted by the CPET Lead and the TET Lead. Members of the CPET and the TET who identify potential risks are to communicate those risks to their respective team lead for consideration and inclusion in the assessment. Risks may be identified by any team or evaluator throughout the evaluation process.
- (c) Risks will be evaluated both as to their potential impact on the offeror's ability to successfully perform the contract and the likelihood of the risk occurring. This analysis will evaluate risks in terms of their potential impact on cost, schedule, and work performance. Risks may be identified within any aspect of the offeror's proposal, or from any additional sources of information.
- (d) The team that assesses risk will identify proposal risks and note the potential impact and likelihood of those risks occurring. Not all risks may be addressed. The evaluators have discretion to determine which risks merit discussion.
- (e) The team that assesses risk will then determine what overall level of risk the entire proposal includes. Determining the overall level of risk is not a numeric average or summation of the number of risks identified. Rather, the level of overall risk associated with a proposal depends on the types of risks identified and the likelihood of their occurrence.
- (f) Categories to be used in assessing risk to the Government are:
 - a. Low risk – Risks in the offeror's proposal, if any, present no more than a minimal likelihood of occurrence or a minimal potential impact on the offeror's ability to deliver services within cost, schedule, or work performance requirements.
 - b. Moderate risk - Risks in the offeror's proposal, are more likely than not to occur or are more likely than not to have an impact on the offeror's ability to deliver services within cost, schedule, or work performance requirements.
 - c. High risk - Risks in the offeror's proposal, are highly likely to occur or are certain to have an impact on the offeror's ability to deliver services within cost, schedule, or work performance requirements.

M.8 BEST VALUE DETERMINATION

(a) The offer that provides the best overall value to the FAA will be selected for award. A tradeoff between technical factors and price may be made. However, the lowest total evaluated priced offer may not provide the best overall value to the Government. Evaluation factors are significantly more important than cost/price. The risk assessment is intended to aid the source selection process by adding more information to the best value determination. If total factor scores are close together price will become more important. Best value will be based on the following:

- Technical Evaluation;
- Cost/Price Evaluation; and
- Risk Assessment.

(b) To arrive at a best value decision, the PET will integrate the evaluation of the specific criteria described above. While the FAA source selection evaluation team will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by nature, is subjective and professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

M.9 NON-GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL PARTICIPATION

Offerors are hereby notified that the FAA may have proposals or other written information provided in response to this acquisition, reviewed by personnel from various support contractors who may serve as advisors to FAA evaluation personnel during the evaluation phase of this acquisition. All non-Government personnel will sign before the evaluation process begins, non-disclosure and conflict of interest statements. The exclusive responsibility for source selection, however, will remain with the FAA. The FAA has plans to use support contractors to take part in the source selection process. These support contractors include personnel from:

- B3 Solutions, LLC; and
- BPA Services, LLC.